

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 94 17:01:41 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #626
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sat, 4 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 626

Today's Topics:

440 in So. Cal. (2 msgs)
 Ham ftp sites?
 Ham Radio few problem
 KENWOOD TH-28A & TH-78A
 Radio networking - with P

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 22:12:39 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

joejarre@netcom.com (Joe Jarrett) writes:

> That's an interesting comment that may be area related. My conversations
> with at least one of the national mail order retailers suggests that the
> vast majority of hand held amateur radios sold today are 2 meter/440 MHz
> dual band radios. Don't know if its true or not . . .

Perhaps they are. However, what percentage of dual-band radios are sold
to new hams purchasing their first radio?

Date: 4 Jun 1994 23:50:03 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Jay Maynard (jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu) wrote:

: They moved up as part of a bargain: "You put your stuff up on 440 and leave
: us alone on 2." Now you're proposing to renege on that deal. Why should you
: be trusted in the future to do anything but take, take, take, and steal?

Hi Jay, welcome to democratic socialism. It's not who occupies something
that matters... what matters is who controls it. In a democratic socialist
state, you are forced to obey the federal government's latest idea of
what is the greatest good for the greatest number. They can change the
rules for anything at any time for any reason.

The great majority of hams believe that the federal government should and
does own all radio frequencies. If one accepts that idea, then if the FCC
says "all amateur repeaters shall be open", the Great OZ has spoken.

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 23:40:18 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
tedtrost@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham ftp sites?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Bob Daniel (rad@tyrell.net) wrote:
: Can't find a FAQ. Where are ftp sites related to ham?

Try the Boston Amateur Radio Club site at:
oak.oakland.edu

Ted Trost, N1RDQ
tedtrost@netcom.com

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 21:57:48 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

> Comments like that are not helpful or contributory. They simply have a
> tendency to piss people off. I seem to recall you lecturing someone on
> this thread about how this or that behavior would cause the person to not
> make many friends. Accusing others of "want(ing) a free ride....."etc.
> is just a way to disregard the real thrust of what is being discussed
> here and instead lower the quality of the discourse to a level you are
> for some reason more comfortable with.

Sorry Roger, that's the way I see it. Legal and moral issues aside, the advocates of no-closed/all-open repeater coordination feel they shouldn't shouldn't have to pay to access spectrum that "belongs" to everyone.

And, while I may agree that its a good policy to promote as many open systems as possible, I also recognize that systems are expensive to set up and maintain - especially good systems with many links, remotes, and excellent coverage. Hence, if those trustees wish to restrict access to the machine to "members only", that's their right.

Its not a question of frequency ownership. Everyone knows that nobody "owns" a frequency. Certainly someone can choose to operate on a repeater input or output, and can probably do so ad infinitum, as long as they're not interfering with its operation.

Amateurs are very greedy when it comes to their spectrum. And, with the welfare-state mentality permeating american society, its only a matter of time before we see that mentality invade amateur radio - and rightfully so, since the attitude of hams involved in ham radio simply mirror those of society as a whole.

I believe that the attitude expressed by some here - dual-band radios are cheap and we want access to that spectrum now, so decoordinate all of the "closed" machines so we can coordinate new yak-boxes which will give us free access to the airwaves - is but one symptom of that problem invading the hobby.

If you disagree, then fine, that's your right.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 21:44:51 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!waikato!comp.vuw.ac.nz!

welcom!jonathan.swan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: KENWOOD TH-28A & TH-78A
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Thanks to a recent reply regarding my TH-28A VHF hand held(& its freqs)
I have mangaged to unearth several undocumented features of these
Kenwood HF/UHF sets ! Why the manuals don't mention them beats me !!!!!

TH-28A Can be easily convinced to cover AM aircraft band (118-136MHz)

1. Turn on & make sure you're in VFO mode on VHF
2. Touch F button for 1 sec or so until it flashes
3. Then touch LOW button. LCD shows 118-136 range (receive only)!!

- * All usual Mem/ Scanning functions available.
- * Repeat steps 2 & 3 to return to normal VHF 136-173 MHz .

TH-78A Can be persuaded to receive cell phones AND < PLAY POKER > !

- CELL 1. Turn on & ensure in VFO mode & on UHF
- PHs 2. Touch F button for 1 second until it flashes on LCD
- 3. Touch BAND button. Display & coverage is then 800-1000Mhz UHF,
& 300 up on VHF. All mem/scanning features available.
4. Repeat procedure to return to normal

POKER !!

1. With set off touch PTT + M + PWR UP keys simultaneously.
(Similar to "3 fingered salute" CTRL+ALT+DEL with PCs)
 2. Display changes to show the card game POKER !!
- * Simply PWR OFF to return to normal radio use.
 - * Actual keys to play the game I have listed here O.K., but will only make available if wanted ... request if you can't work out

Any other "mods" out there ? 73s de ZL2AJZ & ZL2USP in New Zealand

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 21:15:03 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!waikato!comp.vuw.ac.nz!
welcom!jonathan.swan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Radio networking - with P
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The first 2 questions are ... WHAT RANGE, and WHAT DATA RATE do you have
in mind ! Lots of VHF stuff around (often advertised in PC Mag &
Byte, but usually just 9600 bps) with say a few miles range. At the

local area wireless network (LAWN) speeds you fancy (1Mb) range is only 50- 100 metres & easily obstructed by even an office doorway ! (LAWNs usually use spread spectrum in the 1-3 GHz range). If it's just a project you're after why not try something in the Infra Red (IR) ?!! Range will be only 20m or so (but you can bounce signals off the ceiling!), but data rates quite high & with error correcting software things can go O.K.. Hewlett Packard are at the forefront here. If you're a Ham why not consider Packet Radio (but only Modem type speeds) THIS IS A VERY RAPIDLY EMERGING FIELD ,,... READ RECENT PC MAGS FOR PROGRESS users hate cables of course ! Regards from ZL land

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 22:31:47 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
joejarre@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCqq72H.6u4@netcom.com>, <2slc6j\$kkn@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<gregCqtnE8.H5o@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Greg Bullough (greg@netcom.com) wrote:

: Perhaps. However a significant number of amateurs believe that the 'closed'
: repeater is contrary to the principle that no individual or group 'owns'
: a frequency.

Are you suggesting that an "open" repeater does own it's frequency? You are not talking about closed verses open with this statement. You are referring to coordinated verses non-coordinated. A coordinated repeater doesn't "own" a frequency regardless if open OR closed. It, like any other amateur radio operation, has a right to exist without interference, hence the protection from a non-coordinated system.

: However, in areas where spectrum is becoming critical, we believe that the
: band plan should dictate that OPEN repeaters have priority, sometimes to the
: extent that even existing closed sites are offered the option of either
: opening up or giving up the allocation. And we also believe that the
: 'band plan,' as developed by local and national organized Amateur Radio
: groups has sufficient authority to dictate fair spectrum usage.

Who is going to be in charge of this kingly operation that decides who is really good and who is really bad? Does a closed autopatch give you one black mark? How about used of the remote base . . . does a little control here increase the "black" a little more? You are really talking about a grey area that will be very tough to define. Again, all systems

must have some "closed" operations associated with it (like basic control, for instance).

I'm not really straining as much as you think here . . . you have now entered the twilight zone ham radio politics.

--

```
*****
* Joe Jarrett, K5F0G                               |                               *
* joejarre@netcom.com                             |               This area          *
* Information Storage Devices FAE                   |   intentionally left blank      *
* Austin, Texas                                    |                               *
*****
```

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 1994 19:26:25 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!portal.com!portal!combdyn!
lawrence@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <Cqo327.H8r@csn.org>, <2sfrpk\$1si@misr-fsw.jpl.nasa.gov>,
<Cqrx8w.EvJ@csn.org>e
Subject : Re: Yaesu FT-530 Microphone Prob

In article <Cqrx8w.EvJ@csn.org> jwdxt@csn.org (Jim Deeming) writes:
>this phenomenon. However, the HRO fellow did say that the MH-29 is
>designed to filter out background noise, and that requires holding the mike
>close - VERY close - when transmitting. He said holding the mike 6 inches
>away would not cut it, and xmit volume would be lost. He also recommended
>talking right at the lower right hand area of the mike where the element is.
>
>My preliminary testing of this idea seems to indicate HRO was correct. I will
>probably call Yaesu anyway, just to see what they say, but there seems to
>be a solution for now.
>

This would indicate that Yaesu is supplying a correctly designed echo-canceling mike. And, the fact that I talk to like a commercial radio mike probably explains why I haven't had any complaints about my audio.

Of course, the problem with this habit is when I'm talking straight into the radio....my voice tends to be distorted (or so I'm told....over modulation?), and I have to remember to hold the handheld away from my mouth....about 6".

--

WORK: lawrence@combdyn.com | PHONE 403 529 2162 | FAX 529 2516 | VE6LKC
HOME: dreamer@lhaven.uumh.ab.ca | 403 526 6019 | 529 5102 | VE6PAQ

Praxis BBS - 529 1610 | CYSNET BBS - 526 4304 | Lunatic Haven BBS - 526 6957

disclamer = (working_for && !representing) + (Combustion Dynamics Ltd.);

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 22:46:40 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
joejarre@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <gregCqu5LJ.62G@netcom.com>, <2so48a\$g1@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<rogjdCqvMDo.Kx1@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Roger Buffington (rogjd@netcom.com) wrote:

: Comments like "Who died and made you God?" are not helpful.

But that's exactly the point. The people who want to jam it down the
throat of closed repeaters are primarily using the arguement that "we know
whats best, don't bother me with the facts."

If the majority of the people in my neighborhood want me to take down my
tower, that's too bad because there are no covenants that restrict towers
in my neighborhood. They may think it's for the common good that my
tower comes down but it doesn't work that way.

Is this really the way you want amateur radio to work?

--

* Joe Jarrett, K5F0G | *
* joejarre@netcom.com | This area *
* Information Storage Devices FAE | intentionally left blank *
* Austin, Texas | *

Date: 4 Jun 94 22:49:29 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!psgrain!reuter.cse.ogi.edu!
netnews.nwnet.net!news.clark.edu!henson!beaker!tolleef@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994May31.140004.1@clstac>, <060194205830Rnf0.79b4@ham.island.net>,
<2slm12\$P63@kelly.teleport.com>t
Subject : Re: Evergreen Intertie

genew@teleport.com (Gene Wolford) writes:

>Be aware that the usage of this system very structured and that any variance
>from the "offical" method often results in a lecture from an
>Annally Retentive Regulation Loving Kilocycle Cop.
>IE: 3-10 minute time limit, Use the system to contact already known persons,
>that is, no turning on the system to make a new friend in a distant town.

The 3 minute commute and ten minute other time limits were imposed on the system because some individuals were not able to operate without such guidelines. The system worked well for at least 5 years before this restriction had to be placed on the machines.

The system **can** and is used to meet people in distant towns, it must be done with great prudence. Consider what it would be like to liven a major city, whose two meter repeaters are already busy, then link these across an entire state with a continuous coverage of roughly half the state of Washington. It is just a matter of exercising good judgement.

>Also, most network nodes are kept in the "off" mode. A code control cheat
>sheet is neccessary to enable the network for a QSO, and then disable the
>network afterward.

The Intertie is much like internet in that each individual machine is autonomous. It decides whether it wishes to participate in a net, or be on at all. The ability to turn the machines on and off at will (by the users) makes the Intertie flexible.

>It has value, but it could have so much more.

As a former control operator (I am now college and don't have the time to invest) I think that you need to look at the reason for many of these rules that you consider thorns. Perhaps you should become more involved in runs up the hill in the middle of the winter, or better yet in elmering the new, and the old who can't seem to get it together, so that thorns don't grow.

g'day,
Tollef

Tollef Winslow, KB7DNS		Small is the number of them that see with their
voice - (206) 650-2521		own eyes and feel with their own hearts.
fax - (206) 650-2038		- Albert Einstein

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 22:12:48 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
joejarre@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun1.185836.26274@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2skp70\$qbc@tymix.Tymnet.COM>,
<1994Jun3.012445.4308@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

: Yes, that's exactly what I'm saying. The spectrum is a limited public
: resource. Closed repeaters don't serve the amateur community at large
: as well as open systems, so as a policy matter, open repeaters should
: be the preferred occupants of the spectrum.

I'd say it's pretty presumptuous on your part to say closed repeaters
don't serve the amateur community . . . as well as open systems. This
may be your opinion but it's not necessarily fact.

: to serve the needs of the largest number of users. Since open systems
: don't place limits on who can use them, they make their chunk of spectrum
: more accessible to more amateurs than closed systems do.

Actually, a trustee can't really do this any more. Defacto, all trustees
MUST place a limit on who uses their repeater per the FCC. The trustee
may choose to ignore this requirement or just give blanket approval to all,
but it is now their responsibility to know and approve the users of the
repeater in some sort of timely fashion. If they don't, and illegal
operation occurs on the repeater, the trustee is then responsible. You
have to keep up with the new rules and interpretations.

Jay is right, this really should be going on in "policy".

--

```
*****
* Joe Jarrett, K5FOG | *
* joejarre@netcom.com | This area *
* Information Storage Devices FAE | intentionally left blank *
* Austin, Texas | *
*****
```

Date: (null)
From: (null)
Dual-band radios may be the biggest seller because they're so inexpensive today. Thus, everyone is buying one, regardless of their status as a new ham or old.

MD

--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 23:29:21 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
joejarre@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <ddtodd.124.000ABCF1@ucdavis.edu>, <CqLAIs.HwF@news.hawaii.edu>,
<2sfofs\$hg2@btree.brooktree.com>
Subject : Re: Ham Radio few problem

Roger Bly (roger@btree.brooktree.com) wrote:

: You all really extrapolate on that jamming word. :-)

Yes, it is a hot button for most experience repeater people, open or closed. You apparently aren't one of those.

: By jamming, I mean the unauthorized use of a closed repeater, not
: malicious interference. Maybe I need to think of a better word
: for it, but when a bunch of us attack a closed repeater with rapid-fire
: conversation, we call it jamming. We operate legally within Part 97
: and the Communications Act of 1934.

IMHO this is NOT legal operation within Part 97.

--

* Joe Jarrett, K5FOG | *
* joejarre@netcom.com | This area *
* Information Storage Devices FAE | intentionally left blank *
* Austin, Texas | *

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 23:17:53 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!joejarre@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <45806.hberg@sun.sws.uiuc.edu>, <rogjdCqAB3L.9r5@netcom.com>,
<2s5g88\$e7n@btree.brooktree.com>
Subject : Re: Ham Radio few problem

Roger Bly (roger@btree.brooktree.com) wrote:

: Good! Several of us in San Diego are also writing letters, petitioning,
: jamming, etc. to shut down closed repeaters in the amateur service. We should
: probably get more organized.

Fine, Roger. I'm sure you will "prove" your point by jamming. I can't
believe you actually admitted it. Any credibility you had in this
discussion just went down the toilet.

: I said it before, but the FCC is willing to consider a "close repeater
: ban. There there are several commissioners (I know one personally) that
: are sympathetic to our cause. They say the request (RFR) must come from
: the amateur community or politically they can not act. I have not been
: active on lobbying the ARRL... attacking the coordinating bodies might
: be a new angle on this...

I think when the FCC finds out you are advocating jamming, they will be
most ready to hear your side of the story. If they catch you jaming, a
NAL of several grand is appropriate.

--

* Joe Jarrett, K5FOG | *
* joejarre@netcom.com | This area *
* Information Storage Devices FAE | intentionally left blank *
* Austin, Texas | *

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 23:37:01 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
joejarre@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sfofs\$hg2@btree.brooktree.com>,
<1994May31.172630.21416@cs.brown.edu>, <2sg0cv\$3rm@tadpole.fc.hp.com>
Subject : Re: Ham Radio few problem

John Schmidt (jws@fc.hp.com) wrote:

<snip>

: that view, since the only protection repeaters are given is against other
: uncoordinated repeaters on the same frequency (and malicious interference, of
: course). The latest edition of part 97 even states that unintended triggering

The original post that resulted in all this discussion admitted their use
of the repeater WAS MALICIOUS. They were trying to interfere. All your
comments are moot!

: If you insist on operating a system closed to all but a select few, it's up
: to you to secure it appropriately. If you took reasonable measures to secure

Totally disagree. A carrier operated repeater may properly be a closed
repeater. Obviously, someone who didn't know couldn't be held responsible
for any "interference" but if asked to leave, common courtesy dictates
they should. And if it is generally known that a repeater is closed,
shame on you if you just "accidentally" happen to talk on the input.

--

```
*****
* Joe Jarrett, K5FOG | *
* joejarre@netcom.com | This area *
* Information Storage Devices FAE | intentionally left blank *
* Austin, Texas | *
*****
```

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #626
